

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1—109 are cancelled.

Claims 110—129 are new.

Claims Cancellations

The Applicant has cancelled a number of claims. These cancellations should not be seen as an opinion as to the allowability of any claim. Instead, the amendments were made in an effort to further and accelerate the prosecution of the application.

New Claims

The Applicant has presented a number of new claims. These claims have not been examined. However, the Applicant will discuss a representative claim, and address deficiencies of the prior with respect to the claim language.

Discussion of Independent Claim 110 and the Prior Art of Record

Claim 110 recites, one or more computer-readable media comprising computer-executable instructions for implementing an Internet browser, the computer-executable instructions comprising instructions for:

- receiving a request to open a second browser while a first browser is displayed;
- opening the second browser if the request was initiated after receiving a load finished event for the first browser and before receiving an unload event for the first browser; and
- **ignoring the request if the request was received after receiving the unload event for the first browser and before receiving the load finished event for the first browser.**

Claim 110 recites, “ignoring the request if the request was received after receiving the unload event for the first browser and before receiving the load

1 finished event for the first browser". The prior art of record does not teach or
2 suggest such a method of ignoring a request.

3 The Patent Office has previously (with respect to claim 4, 34, 64 and 94)
4 pointed to Kim (at page 1, paragraph 9, lines 1—4) as teaching ignoring a second
5 browser request if the request was initiated after receiving an unload event for the
6 first browser window and before receiving a load finished event for the first
7 browser window. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

8 At page 1, paragraph 9, lines 1—4, Kim teaches that "interstitials" are
9 advertisements served "between pages." Such advertisements are therefore
10 windows or browser instances that are opened after receiving an unload event for
11 the first browser window and before receiving a load finished event for the first
12 browser window. The "unload event" begins actions leading to display of a new
13 page, and the "load finished event" indicates that the new page is displayed (i.e.
14 "loaded"). Therefore, Kim teaches that windows are opened at precisely the time
15 that Claim 110 recites ignoring the request. Accordingly, Kim fails to teach or
16 suggest the elements, as recited by the claim.

17 **Claims 117 and 124** recite elements similar to those recited by Claim 110.
18 Accordingly these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.
19 Additionally, these claims are also allowable for their own recited features that,
20 are neither taught nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
21 combination with one another.

22 **Claims 111—116, 118—123 and 125—129** depend from Claims 110, 117
23 and 124, and are allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim.
24 These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination
25

1 with those recited in Claim 110, are neither taught nor suggested in references of
2 record, either singly or in combination with one another.

3
4 **Discussion of Dependent Claim 111 and the Prior Art of Record**

5 **Claim 111** recites the one or more computer-readable media of Claim 110,
6 wherein opening the second browser instance comprises instructions for:

- 7 • **accessing, using the second browser, a browser history comprising pages visited by the first browser; and**
- 8 • **adding to the browser history in response to navigates from the first and second browsers, wherein the browser history contains pages visited by both the first and second browser.**

9
10 Claim 111 recites, “accessing, using the second browser, a browser history
11 comprising pages visited by the first browser”. The prior art of record does not
12 teach or suggest a browser accessing a history comprising pages visited by another
13 browser.

14 Kim discusses the presentation history of ADs at 0073 line 9 and 0084 lines
15 2 and 3. However, this discussion by Kim does not teach or suggest accessing a
16 browser history comprising pages visited by another browser—it simply teaches a
17 list of the advertisements within Kim’s system. For example, the advertisement
18 and the time of presentation are recorded in the history (see 0084 at line 3 and 4).
19 Thus, Kim teaches a single history used by a single browser instance. Kim fails to
20 teach or suggest a browser history comprising pages visited by both first and
21 second browser instances. Accordingly, Kim fails to teach or suggest a browser
22 history based on a plurality of browsers.

23 Kim discusses an “e-catalog” of ADs ([0106] at lines 4—5). Kim teaches
24 that the browser buttons can be used to navigate through the ADs (see [0110]).
25

1 Kim also teaches that the browser buttons can be used to move between ADs and
2 the e-catalog. Thus, Kim teaches that the e-catalog comprises a number of ADs,
3 and that the user can move among them using the browser buttons. However, the
4 browser buttons taught by Kim fail to teach or suggest a browser having, or
5 accessing, a browser history comprising pages visited by another browser.

6 Kim discloses that the e-catalog and AD constitute a browser instance that
7 is superimposed on the existing browser instance (see [0109]). Thus, Kim teaches
8 the use of two browser instances. However, Kim does not teach or suggest that
9 the e-catalog/AD browser accesses a browser history comprising pages visited by
10 another browser instance. Accordingly, Kim fails to teach or suggest this element
11 recited by Claim 111.

12 Claim 111 has additionally been amended to recite, “adding to the browser
13 history in response to navigates from the first and second browsers, wherein the
14 browser history contains pages visited by both the first and second browser”. The
15 Applicant submits that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest this
16 element recited by the Claim. In fact, Kim teaches and suggests only the
17 conventional technology, wherein each browser maintains its own back and
18 forward history. That is, Kim does not teach or suggest a browser history that is
19 added to by two different browsers.

20 Kim, at [0110], teaches a conventional history arrangement, wherein back
21 and forward buttons are used to browse ADs in the order in which they were
22 presented. At paragraph [0111], Kim teaches a web browser with a display pane
23 and an e-catalog information display. Kim teaches that user action can change
24 what is in the “display pane” portion (right side of Fig. 12) of the browser
25 window. Accordingly, Kim teaches a navigation system for the single browser

1 window seen in Fig. 12 of Kim's disclosure. However, Kim fails to teach or
2 suggest a browser history to which additions are made in response to navigates
3 from first and second browser instances.

4 The Patent Office suggests (see page 7 of the Final Office Action) that
5 paragraph [0049] lines 4—9 of Kim teaches and/or suggests that a browser history
6 could be built from the histories of a plurality of simultaneously open browser
7 windows. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

8 At [0049] Kim teaches a method by which information is delivered. Kim
9 does not discuss browser histories generally. More specifically, Kim does not
10 disclose adding to a browser history using navigates from first and second browser
11 instances. Little detail of the method is provided by Kim at 0049. Kim does not
12 discuss browser history, or how two browsers could contribute to a single history.

13 Thus, Kim fails to teach or suggest, "adding to the browser history in
14 response to navigates from the first and second browser instances". Instead, Kim
15 teaches the conventional operation of a browser, wherein the history for each
16 browser instance is maintained separately.

17 Claim 111 has additionally been amended to recite, "wherein the browser
18 history contains pages visited by both the first and second browser". The
19 Applicant submits that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest this
20 element recited by the Claim. In fact, Kim teaches only conventional technology,
21 wherein each browser navigates based on its own back and forward history, and
22 navigations based on a single browser history based on two browsers is not taught
23 or suggested.

24 Referring to Kim at [0068], at approximately lines 4—12, Kim teaches that
25 a transition between browsing and advertisements, and back again, can be timed to

1 provide the user with advertisements while a page is being downloaded. This
2 transition is not based on a browser history that is used for navigation by both first
3 and second browsers. The transitions taught by Kim are based on the user clicking
4 a link in a browser, which results in a delay during page download, and the
5 subsequent application of an AD. During this delay, Kim teaches the swapping of
6 one browser window (the AD) for another browser window as that browser
7 window downloads a page. Thus, Kim does not teach a unified history of first and
8 second browsers.

9 Kim, at [0110] to [0112], teaches the use a display pane which transitions
10 between ADs, e-catalog and web information. The Applicant submits that these
11 transitions are not in response to a history used for navigation by both the first and
12 second browsers. Instead, Kim teaches that the e-catalog is invoked when the user
13 appears to want to see an AD (see [0108] a line 1). Once invoked, the user can
14 navigate among the ADs within the e-catalog. This does not teach or suggest a
15 browser history is used for navigation by both the first and second browsers.

16 The Patent Office has not suggested that the How-To reference teaches or
17 suggests aspects of browser history. Accordingly, the Kim and How-To fail to
18 teach or suggest, singly or in combination, the elements recited by the Applicant's
19 claims, as newly presented.

20 **Claims 118 and 124** recite similar elements, and are allowable for at least
21 the same reasons.
22
23
24
25

Discussion of Dependent Claims 112 and 113 and the Prior Art

Claim 112 recites the one or more computer-readable media of Claim 111, wherein adding to the browser history comprises instructions for:

- **keeping track of where browser transitions occur.**

Claim 113 recites the one or more computer-readable media of Claim 111, wherein adding to the browser history comprises instructions for:

- **detecting, in the browser history, a transition between the first and second browsers; and**
- **hiding, in response to the detected transition, one of the first and second browsers and displaying the other.**

Claims 112 and 113 are allowable in part because of their dependence on Claims 110 and 111. Additionally, these claims are also allowable for their own recited features are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. For example, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest detecting or tracking browser transitions, or hiding a browser instance in response to a detection.

Browser transitions indicate, in a unified browser history, transition points between pages that were visited by one browser and pages that were visited by another browser. For example, when a new browser is created due to a call for a new window, the creation of that window is a transition in the browser history, i.e. a place in the unified browser history wherein a “transition” from one browser to the other exists. Thus, transitions require two or more browsers, using a unified history. Kim teaches neither of these aspects.

Kim teaches (e.g. at [0110]) that the AD/e-catalog browser (second browser instance) overlaid on the user’s browser (first browser instance) provides back and forward buttons that allow the user to move between ADs. However, Kim does not teach or suggest—for example—that the back button of the second browser

1 includes any portion of the back history of the first browser, as recited by the
2 Applicant's claim. That is, Kim does not teach that the browser history (forward
3 or back history) of the two browser instances is in any way integrated, and that
4 portions of the integrated history are separated by browser transitions.

5 In the bottom quarter of page 6 of the Office Action mailed 02/24/2006, the
6 Patent Office suggests that Kim teaches maintenance of a history of browser
7 transitions. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

8 The Patent Office suggests that Kim, at [0110] to [0112], teaches a browser
9 history transition. The Applicant respectfully disagrees that Kim teaches a
10 browser history that is used for navigation by both the first and second browsers
11 that includes a transition (i.e. a place in the unified browser history that transitions
12 from the pages visited by one browser to the pages visited by the other browser).

13 Referring to the cited passage, Kim discloses navigation between the
14 display of ADs, the e-catalog and web information. No unified browser history is
15 taught or suggested, and therefore Kim does not teach or suggest a transition.
16 Thus, a browser history used by first and second browsers is not taught or
17 suggested.

18 The Patent Office has not suggested that the How-To reference teaches or
19 suggests aspects of browser history. Accordingly, the Kim and How-To fail to
20 teach or suggest, singly or in combination, the elements recited by the Applicant's
21 claims, as newly presented.

22 Conclusion

23 In the interests of advancing prosecution of the application, the Applicant
24 has cancelled a number of claims. New Claims 110—129 recite aspects seen in
25

1 the original claims, and are allowable for the reasons seen above. Should any
2 issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is
3 encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

4 Dated: 24 Oct. 2006

Respectfully Submitted,



David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
(509) 324-9256 ext. 235
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201